national Application No

A CLASS	TIEGATION OF OUR PERSON		17 db20047 001401		
ÎPC 7	G01R33/565		·		
1	to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national class	sification and IPC			
	SEARCHED				
IPC /	GOOD GOOD GOOD GOOD GOOD GOOD GOOD GOOD				
	ation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent th				
Electronic a	data base consulted during the International search (name of data	a base and, where practical, sear	ch terms used)		
EPO-In	ternal, IBM-TDB, COMPENDEX, INSPEC	, BIOSIS, EMBASE,	MEDLINE, WPI Data, PAJ		
С. DOCUMI	ENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT				
Calegory °	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the	relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.		
Y .	DONG S ET AL: "Rectification of distortion in MRI for stereotax PROCEEDINGS OF THE ANNUAL SYMPO COMPUTER BASED MEDICAL SYSTEMS. JUNE 14 – 17, 1992, NEW YORK, I vol. SYMP. 5, 14 June 1992 (1990) pages 181–189, XPO10028189 ISBN: 0-8186-2742-5 Sections "MRI Distortion and Rectification", "Experiments"	y" SIUM ON DURHAM, EEE.D. US	1-8, 23-31, 46-50, 52,55,56		
Y	US 5 099 208 A (FITZPATRICK J M 24 March 1992 (1992-03-24)  column 6, line 1 -column 8, line column 10, line 5-28 figure 1A	·	1-8, 23-31, 46-50, 52,55,56		
X Furthe	er documents are listed in the continuation of box C.	X Patent family member	s are listed in annex.		
° Special care	egorles of clied documents :				
'A' document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance 'E' earlier document but published on or after the International filing date 'L' document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified) 'C' document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means 'P' document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed  'T' later document published after the International filing date or priority date of the or which is considered to the or priority date of the or more other such document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art.  '8' document member of the same patent family					
Date of the ac	ctual completion of the international search	Date of mailing of the intern	ational search report		
	July 2004	13/08/2004			
lame and ma	alling address of the ISA  European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentiaan 2  NL - 2280 HV Rijswijk  Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 epo ni,  Fax: (+31-70) 340-3018	Authorized officer Streif			

national Application No
T/GB2004/001461

C.(Continu	ation) DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT	., 5520	04/001461
Category *	Citation of document, with Indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	<del></del>	Relevant to claim No.
			sievam to claim No.
Y	HAACKE EM ET AL: "Magnetic resonance imaging - Physical principles and sequence design" 1999 , JOHN WILEY & SONS, INC. , NEW YORK XP002287202 ISBN: 0471351288 page 803 -page 804; figure 26.17		1-8, 23-31, 46-50, 52,55,56
P,X	WEISKOPF N ET AL: "Correction of geometric distortion in fMRI: A single-shot technique using multi-echo echo-planar imaging (EPI)" PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR MAGNETIC RESONANCE IN MEDICINE, 11TH SCIENTIFIC MEETING AND EXHIBITION, TORONTO, CANADA, 10-16 JULY 2003, page 1742 XP002287244 the whole document		1-5,8, 23-28, 31, 46-50, 52,55,56
	The same area principa.		•
.			
		ĺ	
			•
	•		
	•		,
	·		
	•		
	·		
-			•
.			
ı		1	

ternational application No. PCT/GB2004/001461

BOX II	Observations where certain claims were found unsearchable (Continuation of item 2 of first sheet)
This Inter	national Search Report has not been established in respect of certain claims under Article 17(2)(a) for the following reasons:
1. X	Claims Nos.: 51,53,54 pecause they relate to subject matter not required to be searched by this Authority, namely:
	Rule 39.1(v) PCT — Presentation of information
b a	Claims Nos.: $9-15$ , $32-38$ ecause they relate to parts of the International Application that do not comply with the prescribed requirements to such in extent that no meaningful international Search can be carried out, specifically:
\$	see FURTHER INFORMATION sheet PCT/ISA/210
3. 🔲 ç	claims Nos.: ecause they are dependent claims and are not drafted in accordance with the second and third sentences of Rule 6.4(a).
Box III O	bservations where unity of invention is lacking (Continuation of item 3 of first sheet)
This Interna	ational Searching Authority found multiple inventions in this international application, as follows:
1. As	s all required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this International Search Report covers all archable claims.
2. As	all searchable claims could be searched without effort juetifying an additional fee, this Authority did not invite payment any additional fee.
3. As	only some of the required additional search fees were timely pald by the applicant, this international Search Report vers only those claims for which fees were paid, specifically claims Nos.:
4. No res	required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant. Consequently, this International Search Report is tricted to the Invention first mentioned in the claims; it is covered by claims Nos.:
Remark on I	Protest  The additional search fees were accompanied by the applicant's protest.  No protest accompanied the payment of additional search fees.

### FURTHER INFORMATION CONTINUED FROM PCT/ISA/ 210

Continuation of Box II.2

Claims Nos.: 9-15,32-38

For the following reasons, the subject-matter of claims 9-15 and 32-38 is considered to lack clarity to such an extent that no meaningful search is possible.

Neither the wording of claims 9-15 and 32-38, nor the relevant passages of the description (page 16, line 20 - page 19, line 5 and page 39, line 11 - page 42, line 2), provide a clear definition of the specification of "data items inside said first and third image boundary" (claims 10 and 33). Therefore, it is unclear whether this wording refers to all items within the area defined by said boundaries or to the items that form the respective boundaries.

However, assuming that the first interpretation is valid, the following additional objection arises.

According to claim 9, first real-space image data items are segmented according to a first image boundary corresponding to the periphery of an image feature in said first real-space image data items (reference numeral 11 in figure 4). Furthermore, a second image boundary is defined according to the periphery of said image feature in second real-space image data items (reference numeral 10 in figure 4).

However, second real space data items are segmented according to a THIRD image boundary defined "according to said first and second boundary" (reference numeral 13 in figure 4). When taking into account that data items outside (inside) said first and third image boundaries are discarded (retained) as defined in claim 10, it would appear that the second segment (that is second real-space data items segmented "according to the third image boundary") does not contain the full image feature but only the intersection between the image feature in the second real-space data items and the third image boundary. Therefore, certain pixels within the first segment (that is first real-space data items segmented "according to the first image boundary") do not have corresponding pixels within the second segment since these pixels have been discarded in the step of "segmenting according to said third image boundary". As a consequence, it is unclear how the mapping algorithm is carried out for these pixels.

The corresponding passages of the description (page 16, line 20 - page 19, line 5 and page 39, line 11 - page 42, line 2) would not appear to provide any further information for clarification of this issue.

The same objection applies to claims 32 and 33 as well.

The applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that claims, or parts of claims, relating to inventions in respect of which no international search report has been established need not be the subject of an international preliminary examination (Rule 66.1(e) PCT). The applicant is advised that the EPO policy when acting as an International

# International Application No. PCT/GB2004 /001461 FURTHER INFORMATION CONTINUED FROM PCT/ISA/ 210 Preliminary Examining Authority is normally not to carry out a preliminary examination on matter which has not been searched. This is the case irrespective of whether or not the claims are amended following receipt of the search report or during any Chapter II procedure.

rational Application No -/GB2004/001461

	cited in search report		Publication date	Patent family member(s)	Publication date
	US 5099208	A 	24-03-1992	NONE	
•					
	1 ,				
			•	·	
		•			
					·
				•	•
			•		
	•				
					•
					•
			•		
					•
DOT COA	210 (patent family annex) (January				